CISATLANTIC CLARIBELLE. Ob, lovelier far than werds can tell
Was Claribelle;
Her bosom had a swan like sweil,
Her hair in golden braidings fell,
And at her cottage in the deal.
Neath times and oaks embowered well,
Lone lived the beauteous Claribelle.
With beauteous pots all round her,
But none to praise her beauty,
Or claim her wife-like duty;
For as yet no swain had found her, BY A. TENNYSON

At last a lover sought her. The lovely, lovely Claribel'e; The tore's, and ther, this gay appearance caught her. And his brilliant manners wrought her To declare "her father's daughter." In him was mated well."

And how did he so win her,
The haughty, sconning Claribell -?
Thes haughty, sconning Claribell -?
These thus, as Fun a sinns r:
One day, when asked to dinner,
(Thin soups, and contards thinner.)
That loveyer he arrayed himse.!f,
Perfumed, and decked, and curled,
In clother which he had bought from SMIT !—
FIRST CLOTHERS OF THE WORLD!

SMITH BROTHERS' One Price Wholesale and Retail Clothing
Marerooms, Nos. 122, 136 and 146 Fulton s., New York.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.-For all manu Sectoring purposes Singer's Sewing Machines are deemed inde-pensable. The public its is tupon having their clothing, &c., made-by them. SINGER'S FAMILY SEWING MACHINE is the latest presented for competition, and being arranged with full knowledge of the defects of other machines for similar uses, has avoided or remedied them all. It is the handsumest Sewing Machine ever made, and the cariest to learn to operate. Using one of these machines is an elegant amusement. Price \$100, with iron I. M. SINGER & Co., No. 458 Broadway.

WATSON'S NEW FAMILY SEWING MACHINE NOW READY.—This improved elastic stitch Machine, being de-algued expressly for family die, is recommended as being more perfect, as well as more ornamental, than any Sewing Machine now in existence. Call and see. Persons having Watson's old Machines, and desirous of exchanging for the improved one, can

SMITHSONIAN HOUSE, Broadway,

"We prefer the WISELER & WILSON SEWING MACHINE for family use."

Office No. 343 Broadway, New-York.

GROVER & BAKER'S CELEBRAYED

STRING MACHINES, No. 493 Broadway.

"From Our own family use, we became fully satisfied that
GROVER & BAKER'S Machine is the best, and we accordingly purabased it."

"To all of which The Tribune says, Amen. That the writer
of a notice of Sewing Machines, that we lately published, prefers Wheeler & Wilson's does not make them preferable."

[N. Y. Tribune, Nov. 9, 1857.

HUNT, WEBSTER & Co.,

IMPROVED TIGHT-STITCH SEWING MACHINES.

We are now prepared to exhibit this newly invented and valuable instrument, and would respectfully solicit a call from all persons in want of a Sewing Machine whose qualities have only to be tried to be duly appreciated. We have opened the commodious rooms, No. 469 Broadway, for the sale of these machines, and all interested are respectfully invited to examine and decide apon their merits for themselves.

HUNT, WEBSTER & Co., No. 469 Broadway.

SEWING MACHINES-PRICE \$12 TO \$30 .-PRATT's PATERT has now been in use tearly two years, and have proved themselves to be the best in the market for families. They are warranted to give satisfaction. Office 577 Broadway. SPRING HATS-BIRD, No. 49 Nassau-st.-The

standard and other Myles of GENTLENAN'S HATS are now ready to which the attention of our customers and the public is respec-fully invited. LOOK!!!—Low prices for CARPETS!!!— 220,000 worth of English Carpeting at a tremendous redustion. English VELVET CARPETS 9, 10, and 11/ per yard! Buglish BRUSSELS CARPETS 95, 71, and 85, per yard! Beautiful INGRAIN CARPETS 3, 4/, and 5, per yard!

Oil CLOTH 2/6, 3/, and 4/ per yard! HIRAM ANDERSON, No. 99 Bowery DESPERATELY BURNT BY CAMPHENE. I will cure any of these unfortunate cases with my Magnette Salve, or make no charge. Dr. S. B. Smith, No. 77 Canal-st., new Church. For sale also at Drugglets, and at Goold's Station-ery Store, Tribune Building.

POSTAGE STAMPS (3 and 10 cent), for sale at

New-Hork Daily Tribune.

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1858.

TO CORRESPONDENTS. Subscribers, in sending us remissances, frequently cont to men-tion the name of the Post Office, and very frequently in-name of the State, to which their poper is to instant. Always mention the name of the Post Office and State. No miles can be taken of anonymous Communications. Whatever is intended for traveline must be authenticated by the memo and address of the writer—not necessarily for publication, but as a generaty of his good faits.

We cannot undestake to n-tumn rejected Communications.

An explanation of the case of the Commissioners of Emigration at Albany will be found in another column. It puts a different light on the matter from that in which it has hitherto appeared. Instead of wishing to avoid an investigation, the Commissioners desire to have one; while it is the "runner" interest, represented by Mr. Jake Smith, which now exhibits a reluctance to have the usefu process set on foot. We trust the Assembly will see to it that the subject is thoroughly overhauled.

In Congress, on Saturday, Mr. Wade of Ohio made one of his straightforward speeches, calling things by their right names and charging homeupon the South its aggressions upon the North and upon freedom. A charp discussion relative to the Toombs bill and the meeting at Judge Douglas's house fellowed, in which Mr. Broderick got the better of Mr. Bigler, but intimated that Mr. Douglas would finally dispose of him when he should have recovered his health.

The House was not in session.

If we thought comments could add to the force of the exposure made by Col. Harris of the deliberate disregard and defiance of the order of the House by Mr. A. H. Stephens, and his packed majority of the Kansas Investigating Committee, we should hardly write of aught else; but the simple record of propositions and votes submitted by the Chairman of the Committee is so eloquent that attempts to elucidate it would be uscless. No man of decent intelligence can read that record and not realize that the Speaker packed that Committee on purpose to stifle and defeat the investigation ordered by the House—that the tools were admirably fitted to their work-and that the great Barnacle art-How Not to do it-was never more strikingly illustrated. Whatever the packed majority dared not vote down they mustered courage to lay on the table. Would tha every honest man in the country could but be in duced to read Col. Harris's truthful and impressive record!

If Orsini did not kill Louis Napoleon, he cer tainly killed Palmerston. Made dictator of England by a Chinese Mandarin at Canton, it is historicall, appropriate that this political gamester shoul finally be ruined by an Italian Carbonaro at Paris. But that he should be succeeded by Lord Derby is something above the range of mere historical pro priety, and approaches the dignity of a historical law. It is in accordance with the traditional working of the British Constitution. Pitt was followed by Fox; Fox by Perceval, a weaker Pitt: Wellington by Grey, a weaker Fox; Grey by Wellington; Wellington by Melbourge, a weaker Grey: Melbourne by Wellington again, under the name of Peel; Peel by Melbourne again, under the name of Russell; Russell by Derby, the substitute of Peel; Derby again by Russell. Why should not Palmerston, the usurper of Russell's place, be followed by Derby in his turn

If there be in England any new force able to put an end to the ancient routine exemplified by this last change of places between right honorable gentlemen on one side of the House and right honorable sures, will be a blow and a discouragement to that

gentlemen on the other side; if there be any man or body of men able to confront and supplant the traditional governing class, the world has not jet found it out. But of one thing there can be no doubt; and that is, that a Tory Administration is far more favorable to every kind of progress than any other. For the last fifty years, all popular movements have either been initiated er consummated under Tory rule. It was a Tory Ministry which passed the Catholic Emancipation bill. It was under a Tory Ministry that the Reform movement grew irresistible. The imposition of an Income tax, which, however incongruous in its present state, contains the germs of proportional taxation, is the work of a Tory Ministry. The Apti-Corn-Law League, weak and timid under the Whig Administration, assumed revolutionary dimensions under the Tories; and while Russell, in his most audacious flights, never ventured beyond the limit of a fixed duty, as moderate as himself. Peel could not but consign the Corn Laws to the grave of all the Capulets. So, too, it is the Tories who have, so to say, popularized the aristocracy by briingng plebeian vigor and talent to reenforce its energies. Through the Tories. Canning, the son of an actress, lorded it over the old landed aristocracy of England; so did Peel, the son of a parvenu cotton spinner, who had originally been a hand-loom weaver; so does Disraeli, the son of a simple literary man, and a Jew into the bargain. Lord Derby himself converted the son of a small shopkeeper of Lewes into a Lord High Chancellor of England, under the name of Lord St. Leonards. The Whigs, on the other hand, have always proved strong enough to bury their plebeian tools in vain decorations, or to drop them by dint of haughty insult. Brougham, the soul of the Reform movement, was nullified by being made over to the Lords; and Cobden, the chief of the Anti-Corn-Law League, was offered the place of Vice President of the Board of Trade by the very Whigs he had reinstalled in office.

In point of mere intellectual ability, the new Cabinet can easily bear comparison with its predecessor. Men like Disraeli, Stanley, and Ellenbo rough, suffer no harm when matched against people of the stamp of Mr. Vernon Smith, late of the Board of Control, of Lord Panmure, a War Minister, whom nothing but his "Take care of Dowb," can ever make immortal, and of Sir G. C. Lewis, of Edinburgh Review duliness, or even against such moral grandeurs as Clanricarde of the Privy Seal. In fact Palmerston had not only replaced the Ministry of all parties by a Ministry of no party, but also the Cabinet of all the talents by a Cabinet of no talent except his own. There can be no question that Palmerston had

no idea of the finality of his ruin. He believed Lord Derby would decline the Premiership now as he had done during the Crimean war. Russell would then have been summoned to the Queen; but with the bulk of his own troops serving under Palmerston, and the bulk of the hostile army arrayed under Disraeli, he would have despaired of forming a Cabinet, especially as he, a Whig, could not resort to the "ultimate reason" of dissolving a Parliament elected under the Whig banners. Palmerston's return to office, after a week's oscillation, would thus have become inevitable. This fine bit of calculation has been nullified by Derby's acceptance. The Tory Ministry may hold office for a longer or shorter period. They may go on for several months before they are compelled to resort to a dissolution -a measure they are very sure to employ before they finally - resign their power. But we may be certain of two things, namely: that their career will be marked by the introduction of exceedingly liberal measures in regard to social reforms (Lord Stanley's course thus far, and Sir John Pakington's education bill, are a pledge of this); and above all, that in foreign policy they bring with them a most beneficial and cheering charge. It is true, many shallow thinkers and writers argue that Palmerston's fall is not a damaging blow to Louis Napoleon, because several of the new Tory Ministry are personally on good terms with the French despot, and England in no condition to wage war with a giant Continental power. But it is precisely because England is in answer given by Great Britain to the bullying menaces and exactions of Louis Napoleon's satraps most significant. It was not because Malmesbury and Disraeli were to come into the Ministry that the independent Liberals in Parliament, reflecting the undoubted and emphatic sentiment of the Nation, answered the dispatch of Walewski by throwing out Palmerston's Conspiracy bill. Lord Derby may stumble and fall, but the vote which carried Milner Gibson's amendment will live and bear fruit, nevertheless.

We do not believe in any cordial and lasting alliance between British Torvism and French Bonapartism. The instincts, traditions, aspirations of both parties revolt at it. We do not believe it possible that the new Cabinet will take up and press Palmerston's Conspiracy bill, as the Paris ournals so confidently anticipate. If they do, it will not be till after they shall have answered Walewski and De Morny, and answered them in the spirit of Pitt and Castlereagh. Torpism, with all its faults, must have changed its nature to be ready to change the laws of England at the beck of

But the significance of the late vote is unaffected by any presumption of speedy feud between the two Governments. It is as a proclamation to Europe that Britain has ceased to play second to French Imperialism that we deem it most important. Thus it is understood at Brussels, at Turin, and even at Vienna; thus it will soon be understood at Berlin, at Madrid, at St. Petersburg. England, so long the jailer of the first Napoleon, has pointed ly refused to be longer the jackal of his successor. Every capital of Europe breathes more freely in consequence; every Liberal feels sure that the triumphant uprising of the People is much nearer than t was a month ago. We cite in confirmation a single passage from the speech of England's foremost orator, and one of her most promising statesmen-Mr. Gladstone, long the bosom friend of Sir Robert Peel, the representative of the University of Oxford-who, in the great debate which hurled

Palmerston from office, said: "These times are grave for liberty. We live in the nineteenth century. We talk of progress: we believe that we are advancing; but can any man of observa-tion who has watched the events of the last few years in Europe have failed to perceive that there is a move-ment, indeed, but a downward and backward move-ment? There are a few spots in which institutions that claim our sympathy still exist and flourish. They that claim our sympathy still exist and flourish. They are secondary places, may, they are almost the holes and corners of Europe, so far as mere material greatness is concerned, although their moral greatness will, I trust, insure them long prosperity and happiness. But in these times more than ever does responsibility center upon England; and if it does center upon England; and if it does center upon England, upon her principles, upon her laws, and upon her governors, then I say that a measure passed by this House of Commons—the chief hope of freedom—which attempts to establish a moral complicity between us and those who seek safety is repressive mea-

sacred cause in every country in the world." [Loud Bear in mird that Mr. Gladstone was urged by Lord Derby to accept a very high place in his Cabinet, and that there has not recently been, and is not likely soon to be, a Premier who would not gladly share with him the gravest responsibility.

We have already published Senator Seward's last speech, and have expressed our commendation of it in such general terms as we think it deserved. There are some points of it, however, to which we do not yield our assent; and to avoid misinterpretation, we wish to allude to them. But first we wish to express our dislike to the system of generalizing upon subjects of immediate interest, that require practical treatment, into which some statesmen and legislators are prone to fall. For example, we dis like to be told, as we were by the late Mr. Webster, that the laws of climate are against the spread of Slavery in certain latitudes, and that therefore it is not worth while to concern ourselves in the passage of specific enactments to exclude that very peculiar institution from such latitudes. We thank no man for thrusting a general princip'e in our face as a reply to a proposal to do a reasonable act. Instead of the late Mr. Webster, therefore, who was against "Wilmot" in the cases of Utah and New-Mexico, we prefer the former Mr. Webster, who, before he became sublimated in his principles of legislation, advocated and applied a "Wilmot" to Oregon.

M. Guizot, while managing the political affairs of Louis Philippe, was fond, according to his menta habit, of dealing in generalities, and acting on his theories, instead of dealing with the actual facts of his situation. Thus, immediately before the revolution which sent his master into a precipitate and unanticipated retirement, the philosophic statesman, instead of penetrating, as it was his duty to have done, the actual circumstances around him, busied himself in composing essays to demonstrate, by an exposition of the broad concatenations of historical progress, that a revolution at that uncture was impossible. His philosophic exposition and the news of the revolution got publicity in several distant European capitals on the same day. Germane to this subject are some observations of that usually clear-sighted and hard-headed Yankee, Senator Collamer of Vermont. He is a man who generally goes directly to the point and makes his blows tell about as certainly and effectively as any man in the Senate. But even he took to philosophizing a few days ago after this fashion :

few days ago after this fashion:

"I cannot but say, at times, that if we look at the subject of African Slavery on a broad and liberal scale, and with reference to great periods in the progress of the world, it is after all a very small subject, a very little affair. I think from the foot-prints they have left behind, it is obvious that the family of man makes around this earth great cycles of revolution. They follow the setting sun. The human family are prompted by reasons which they cannot control and which they hardly understand. Their pregress is from the east westward. At the present moment, the great exodus of Europe, which is throwing its avalanche on this continent, joined with the emigrants from the northern and eastern portions of this country, go to swell the great tide of emigration. The family of man is led out to passess its great patrimony. It is going around the earth, and the little accidental colonization of a few Africans here, compared with this, is nothing but small eddies along the margin of the great stream. It is a small matter in the long run, but it seems to be enough to agritate our day and our the great stream. It is a small matter in the long run, but it seems to be enough to agitate our day and our time, though I can hardly consider it worthy of the great attention and deep regard of philosophic states-

Now, part of this is harmless, part of it stands directly in the way of the Senator's legislative duty, and the whole of it is false. In respect to the first clause of the statement-that history shows the movement of population to be uniformly toward the west-it is not true. Taking the generally-received ideathat the original sources of population lie to the westward of the Indus-which, we presume, Senator Collamer does not reject, we perceive that the great currents of population have flowed eastward from that source, rather than to the west. The largest portion of the great human hive lies in India and China, and not in Europe and America. Population has not, then, thus far in its great historic movements. " followed the setting sun." It went first and naturally toward its rising. It only took the opposite direction when the Eastern Continent and the great islands beyond had become occupied. It is the occupation of the land that checks emigration; it is its unoccupied condition The present current westward owes its existence simply to the fact that on this continent are unoccupied lands, a salubrious climate and free government. There is no occult or transcendental philosophy in the case. As to the statement of the Senator, that a "little

accidental colonization of a few Africans" on this continent is but the "small eddy of a large stream, deserving no great attention or regard from philosophic statesmen," we submit that his "philosophy" is quite too narrow for the subject. Mr. Collamer ought to know that it is not as a stream of emigration that the African race has maiply derived consideration on this continent. It is their personal condition that gives significance to that race, and not by any means solely in reference to themselves either, but in reference to the race that holds and proposes to hold them in subjection. Yet the Ethiopianizing of this continent is no such small fact as the Senator seems to regard it. On the contrary, it is a great, a stupendous fact. Behold the results of immigration from Africa. The numerous and magnificent islands of the Caribbean Sea, whose situation, beauty of scenery and fertility of soil, render them almost the garden of the world, are in African hands. The progress of population shows that they are gradually eating out every other race there. and that ultimately those islands must be held in their exclusive possession. As with them, so it is getting to be with extensive portions of South America; so it is with the Gulf States of this Republic; and so it is to be with Central Americaall of which countries are subject to the same general law of population, and will ultimately inherithe same general destiny. The wrong and outrage which the African has suffered by being torn from his own country to serve the white man's greed will have its compensation, is already having it, in the possessions the black man is acquiring on the best parts of this continent. While Mr. Collamer has on his "philosophical" spectacles, let him cast his glance in the direction we have indicated, and perhaps he will discover that the present and prospective Africanization of very extensive portions of this continent now, and in a long bereafter, is no such very small fact after all. So far as the slavery of the African race is concerned, that has, or may have, still mightier relations and consequences, but into that question we shall not enter. We leave Mr. Collamer to study it at his leisure.

Mr. Seward's generalizations are ever abundant Indeed, he is always quite too axiomatic for our taste, as a practical statesman. The one particular effort in this line in his late speech to which we feel especially drawn, which more than another excites our surprise, is this statement:

"Mr. President, the expansion of territory to make

Slave States will only fail to be a great crime because it is impracticable, and therefore will turn out to be a stupendous imbeculity."

Mr. Seward here declares it is impracticable to do just what the country has been doing during Mr. Seward's own public life, and just what the ruling interest declare it is their purpose to do in the future. Does Mr. Seward really mean to say that either our times or our circumstances, the maxims of our National Administration or the principles of the Constitution as now expounded by the Federal Courts, forbid "the expansion of territory to make Slave States"? Or does he mean to say merely that if they are made they will be unmade This must be the meaning of the Senator. But this, it seems to us, is very much like declaring that Slavery will no longer exist because it will not exist forever. The annexers of Texas, authors of Ostend Manifestoes and Central America fillibusters might well laugh in their sleeves over such an axiom, in view of the facts of the case. In reply to what Mr. Seward says cannot be, they can triumphantly point to what is. Was the annexation of Texas an impracticability and an "imbecility" as regards the spread of Slavery? Mr. Seward may say so, and undertake to philosophize away one of the most pregnant facts of our political history; but a man must get into a very rapt and millennial state of mind to believe him. Mr. Seward's philosophy is too fine for every-day wear. If the men who are striving to convert this Government into an engine for the spread and perpetuation of Slavery are simply engaging in an "imbecility," why need practical statesmen oppose or resent the effort? We think President Buchanan in his efforts to buy for us or steal for us three or four new Slave States in Cuba, and President Walker, who proposes to rob for us in Central America, may well look with great complacency upon the views of Senator Seward. We do not wonder that the sappers and miners for Slavery compliment Mr. Seward upon his soaring speculations; but while they do this, they very industriously prosecute their work on earth, and, when Mr. Seward comes down, he will understand the meaning of their compliments.

But, leaving the matter of generalization, we come to a practical proposition of our distinguished Senator. He proposes the reinstatement of the Missouri restriction, and on this point we again let him speak for himself:

"It would be wise to restore the Missouri prohibi-tion of Slavery in Kansas and Nebraska. There was peace in the Territories and in the States until that great statute of Freedom was subverted."

One of the principal objections, if not the chief objection, to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. was, that it would compel the Free States to fight a battle for the Freedom of the territory north of 36° 30', while it had by bargain and sale been once already made over to us in perpetuity. We did not cant to take the trouble, nor incur the risk of loss, in this battle. But we have had to do both. The result has been favorable. The right has triumphed, or is on the eve of a triumph. Money has been lavished and valuable lives have been sacrificed. A still greater number may yet be taken by a hateful oppression before Freedom shall be as firmly planted on the territory north of 36° 30', as it was before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. But the territory is again ours. What, then, do we want of an act of Congress saying Freedom shall have what it has won by its own good right arm, and intends to keep by the same token ? This would be but mockery indeed. But this is not the worst of the proposition. The restoration of the Missouri restriction takes with it its original implications. These were that Slavery should have the territory south of that line. But these implications have been destroyed in the contest, and Freedom is now as free to carry its conquests South as it was to make them where it has made them. Do we desire to relinquish this advantage? We do relinquish it if we restore the Missouri restriction. Most certainly, we are entirely opposed to any such proposition at this stage of the Slavery contest. We have suffered every possible evil that could be suffered from the repeal, and now, if we can obtain any benefits from it, we are certainly entitled to them, and should be indeed "imbesile" to voluntarily forego such advantages.

So long as there seemed the elightest prospect that Walker and his fillibusters would be able to establish themselves in Central America, they had n The N. Y. Times a most hearty advocate. It was only when they were fairly shipped out of the country they had so generously volunteered to reduce from a state of ansrchy to liberty and good order, to raise from poverty and misery to a higher point in the scale of civilization, that The N. Y. Times at last found out that they were a miserable set of robbers. The zeal which that journal lately displayed for regenerating Central America by fillibuster conquest is now bestowed in advocating what it is pleased to call a Mexican protectorate. And the ground upon which it proposes such a protectorate is precisely the ground, neither more nor less, upon which it formerly apologized for and sought to

promote the fillibustering operations of Walker. "We assume," says that journal, "that the great body of the Mexican population would hail an American protectorate as a welcome escape from unendurable ills." What are those "unndurable ills?" Alleged anarchy and frequent civil war. But since The N. Y. Times itself informs us that this state of things has prevailed in Mexico for thirty years past, it would not seem to be so very "unendurable" after all. If the Mexicans have been able to endure it for thirty years past, why may they not continue to endure it for thirty years to come? At any rate, the assumption that the Mexicans would hail an American protectorate is utterly gratuitous. There have been some instances in history in which a discomfited faction or an expelled leader had invited foreign assistance-pever an instance in the world in which the body of a people, however they may have suffered from their own ignorance and incapacity, or that of their rulers, have invited or welomed a foreign protectorate. Nor is there a single act or word of any constituted or representative body in Mexico, or even of any influential individual, which has the slightest look toward calling in foreign rulers, and, least of all, us. This very thirty years of anarchy and civil war which The N. Y. Times throws in the teeth of the Mexicans has grown out of the attempt to get rid of a Spanish protectorate, and there is every reason to believe that the attempt to substitute for it a North American protectorate would be resisted with no less

If The N. Y. Times will obtain a little more knowledge than it seems at present to possess of the population and productions of Mexico, perhaps its zeal for "protecting" the Mexicans may be semewhat abated. The statement of that journal that "six of her seven millions are black," is just as baseless and reckless as most of the other asser-

proportion of "black" people in Mexico is even less than in the State of New-York. That portion of the Mexican population which is not of European, is mainly of Indian blood. But this, according to the doctrine laid down in the Dred Scott case, does not afford any ground for reducing the Mexicans to Slavery, it being only persons of African descent who are obnoxious to that condition. But even though this difficulty could be got rid of, the anticipation of The N. Y. Times of "an immensely valu-'able trade for ourselves and Europe" could hardly, under any circumstances, be realized. Mexico has silver mines, but the ore is very poor, and the silver can only be procured by an expenditure of labor which, on the average, leaves but a small margin for profits. In an agricultural point of view, Mexico holds only a secondary rank. She suffers extremely from drouth. A large part of her surface is rendered incapable of cultivation from this cause alone; while even in those parts which can be cultivated, the crops are often precarious. The best part of Mexico is on the bigh table-land of the interior; and here, the distance from the coast and the difficulties of transportation make it impos sible to raise crops to be exported out of the country. The Mexicans always must continue to live very much within themselves, nor is there anything in the country which could ever enable it, under any circumstances, to assume a leading mercaptile position.

It is a very sage rule not to count one's chickens

before they are hatched. This rule some of our

cotemporaries appear to have forgotten in their

somewhat premature glorifications over the joint French and English occupation of Canton. Nobody, after the experience of the former Anglo-Chinese war, had the slightest doubt that Canton might easily be taken by a small body of European troops. The French and English allies have as yet schieved nothing beyond what everybody had marked out for them. But to conclude, from the occupation of Canton, that the Chinese puzzle is solved; that the Chinese will henceforth cease to regard the rest of the world as outside barbarians; that they will become incontinently reconciled to the opium trade; and that before another Summer has passed away foreign embassaders may be residing at the Imperial Court; certainly the ground upon which these conclusions are arrived seems to be sufficiently slight. After having seen so many cities in the very heart of the empire occupied within a few years past by rebels, the Imperial Court seems not very likely to be brought so suddenly to terms by the mere occupation by outside barbarians of a single distant frontier city, and that not of the first rank. Meanwhile, what are the French and English to do with Canton now they have got it? To take it was easy; to plunder it by means of forced contributions will not be difficult; but after it is plundered, what then? Efforts were made to induce the civilized world to forget the atrocious and disgraceful origin of the first Anglo-Chinese war by large promises of the benefits which trade, civilization and Christianity were to derive from it. Those promises have all proved illusory, and now a second war has been undertaken in order to realize what the first failed to accomplish. The conquest of Canton is not, however, the conquest of Chins. If five thousand troops are sufficient for the capture and occupation of that city, Canton, it is to be recollected, is but one, and one of the most assailable, of many hundred cities, the occupation of which in like manner would require many hundred thousand troops. Little skilled as the Chinese are in the art of war, personally they are no contemptible adversaries, and the climate is an auxiliary which would very rapidly thin the ranks of a European army. With India to reconquer and occupy, the English are not likely to have many men to spare for a conquest-of China; and as to a joint French and English conquest, not only would that be a novelty in history, but the present position of Napoleon III. and his relations to the English people are not very favorable to such an enterprise.

It remains still to be seen whether the occupa tion of Canton has improved or has damaged the position of outside barbarians in China. From the obstinacy thus far shown by the Chinese, there the loss of this single city will break their spirit, overcome their prejudices, or lead to any material change in that policy of restricted intercourse with foreigners upon which they have always acted.

The Herald in substance admits that it is our Government, not the French, which is to decide authoritatively whether Col. Allson's alleged complicity in the late attempt to destroy Louis Napoleon subjects him to extradition. So far, good But it persists in affirming that the offense of Col. Allsop is civil, not political, because there was no revolution actually in progress-no general uprising-no actual war-when that offense was com-

Query: Will The Herald be good enough to say whether there was or was not a revolution or civil war raging in France when Louis Napoleon landed with fifty-three followers at Boulogue in 1840 (from that "nest of assassins," England,) and commenced a fight which resulted in at least one death. Suppose he had escaped to this country and Louis Phillippe had demanded him, would The Herald, with the law standing as at present, have insisted that he be given up?

The majority House report, of which a summary was transmitted by the telegraph on Wednesday, rests its advocacy of the Lecompton Constitution exclusively on the ground of apparent regularity (so far as the record shows, and so far as the Committee chose to look into the matter) in the proceedings for the formation of that Constitution, whence the Committee concludes to its absolute binding force, not only on the people of Kansas, but on Congress and the people of the United States, who, on the mere face of the record, without looking into the facts, are bound, according to this report, to accept the Lecompton Constitution as embodying the will and expressing the wishes of the people of Kansas.

We have been furnished with the following extract from a forthcoming legal work, now in the press, in which the question of the admission of new States incidentally arises, and which appears to us a very conclusive answer, in a legal point of view, to the ground assumed in Mr. Stephens's

The formation and admission of a State of the "The formation and admission of a State of the United States is the action of two parties, two political persons, exercising certain powers as sovereign. It is an autonomic contract or agreement above positive law (law in the ordinary sense), not under it.

"The will of one, the new State, is that of those who, in a corporate capacity or as one political person, would become the political people of the new State at the remains of its existence.

would become the political people of the new State at the moment of its existence.

"A method for agentaining their corporate will as baseless and reckless as most of the other assertions by which it attempts to justify its proposed assumption of the guardianship of Mexico. The with But (if it is admitted that the will of this people

and the will of the majority of the individual coace. uents are identical) the result (a vote may or may not accord with the will of this corporate people. For this people or a majority of them may have decimal to indicate their will under the law. to indicate their will under the law.

"But, to all persons who do not represent these traparties in their autonomic action, the result under the law is conclusive. Such persons are bound to find the will of the corporate people in the resulting rote, ast to recognize no other indication of that will.

"But the other sovereign party—the United States or those who represent them in this autonomic solice. Congress (and the less so if they made the law), we ast thus bound under law. They may regard better thus bound under law. They may regard better with—if any there be—for here they are autonomic with—if any there be—for here they are autonomic acts of violence, wrong and outrage. But if it should be more indicative of the will of the other party in people of the future State) than the vote under law interest.

Estoppels, legal fictions, the contrivances of leg. yers by which fact is made to give place to sumption, whatever may be their utility in the ... tlement of private controversies between individals-and even for this purpose they are fast to ing out of fashion-can have no application to case like that of the admission of Kansas-a case in which Congress is not acting as a judge, but a one of the parties ininterest.

The Cincinnati Enquirer, on the 10th day of the March, 1858, says:

"It is objected to the Lecompton Constitution that it excludes free negroes and mulattors from the State In this, however, they but copied the Black Republican Topeka Constitution, which has a stringent previous of the same character, and does not allow a few black person to reside in Kansas."

All this was utterly exploded two years ago. W. have printed the Topeka Constitution at least twice in full (see "A History of the Struggle for Slavery Restriction"), and there is not one word of this "stringent provision" in it. And yet, Senston a debate have asserted the contrary uncontradicted within the last month!

The grain of truth which sustains this pyramid falsehood is this: The Topeka Convention was solicited, entreated, to vindicate the Free-State party from the current Border-Ruffian taunt that they were "nigger-thieves," by excluding Free Black from the State by constitutional interdict. It was urged that such an exclusion would disabuse to People of Missouri and prevent further invasions from that quarter. The Convention refused to be this, but passed instead a special resolve that the first State Legislature elected under this Constitution might exclude Free Blacks from Kansas if they should, meantime, be instructed by a vote of the People to do so. A vote was accordingly taken simultaneously with that which ratified the Count. tution, and a majority voted to instruct the Legislature as proposed. The Legislature, however, never did anything of the kind; so that there is nothing either in the Topeka Constitution or in any lan passed under it, which prevents the settlement of Free Blacks in Kansas. Even if the Legislatus had passed such an act as was contemplated, my subsequent Legislature might have repealed it But sothing of the kind, we are confident, we ever done, and the right to do it under the Topela Constitution has now lapsed.

We have probably corrected this same misstate ment several times before. Is there never to be a

The Herald chimes in with and backs up the sertion of Senator Hammond of South Carolina that " the great mass of the white people at the North-those who work to earn their bread and have saved no property in advance—can be set in the same category with the slaves of the South." It is said that the wish is often father to the thought, and, whatever may be the case with Gov. Hammond such we take unquestionably to be, in part at less the origin of The Herald's readiness to back up and reëcho what the Governor says of Northern white laborers. The assertion of that journal that the isborers of the North are no better than whiteslard, or, for that matter, than negro slaves, may, if least, be relied on as proof of The Herald's with and aim to make them so. We are justified in coscluding that it desires to make slaves of our North ern white laborers, while its highest ambition for itself is to crack the whip over them in the capacity of overseer for masters who refuse to recognize on its part any claim of social equality. Perans, however, in judging of the which it ascribes to that great body of our ment the North who have their own way to make in the world, The Herald pushes rather too far the principle of judging its neighbors by itself. We must however, admit that, with these ideas on the subject of white slaves, it is quite consistent in its vocacy of the Lecompton Constitution.

There seems to be some hope that justice will st last overtake some of the small fry of the fraternity of gamblers infesting every street of the sity. The policy and lottery ticket venders, a some of whom the Mayor has already caused to be arrested made the best case they could the other day in the suit of The People against Jacob Borget. Afters full hearing of argument the Recorder took up to whole body of law bearing upon the case, and a the close of a thorough examination refused motion to quash the indictment: which decision's as much as to say, that no man presumptirely guilty of violating the laws against this species of gambling, shall escape trial by reason of unimportant emissions in the wording of the statutes, or of the indictments. But the inferential effect of this ruling is its most important feature. It shows that the Criminal Court is ready and willing to esecute laws which have been too long disregarded, and that, so far as the Recorder is concerned, a trial must follow a regular indictment. This commend sble disposition was further shown yesterday by decision in other cases of the same tenor where cape was attempted by pleading a technicality, the Recorder overruling a demurrer, and deciding the the indictments were properly framed. The cost dinate branch of the Court (the City Judge) 000 curs in these views, and there will be no different ecision next month.

Now if the prosecuting officers and the police will do their duty, we may hope for a geen breaking up of the smallest and yet most desired tive species of gambling known in the city. Pm ably as many as fifty thousand people, mainly of the very poorest and most ignorant classes, are policy gamblers. Risks are taken for all sums, from one cent to a thousand dollars, the greater numberplaying the small figures of a few cents per day, but so far infatuated as to beg, or even steal, to get the means to keep up the exciting swindle, No tenths of the colored people are constant custom ers; thousands of poor laborers, women especially. weste a large portion of their small earnings is this transparent robbery; and not a few citizens of high standing owe their ruin to the infatuation. Take species of gambling supports four-fifths of the secalled exchange offices, while hundreds of itineran policy sellers, book in hand, explore dwellings and shops to ply their traffic. If we may fairly isdulge a belief that an honest effort will be made to